

REMARKS

Claim 8 has been written in independent form to secure the allowance of claims 8-10.

Claim 1 is rejected as anticipated by Housas USP 4,487,421. With regard to this reference and the cited Ström USP 4,223,896 there is a difference between two components of a connection being telescoped to bring them together and the joint being a telescoping joint. The latter is customarily referred to the two components being made to slide relative to each other while sealed to each other. The former refers to shoving one member into another to make them up where, after makeup, they are not intended to move with respect to each other.

The two references cited by the Examiner are telescoped to make them up but are not telescoping joints when made up. More specifically, Housas discloses a bell and spigot joint used in water and sewer lines that are buried underground. There is no relative motion between the tubulars when a bell and spigot joint is made up. This reference does not have nested tubulars that are slidably mounted with respect to each other when they define the annular space between them.

Furthermore, claim 1 has been clarified to indicate that the tubular that supports the seal is the tubular that applies the activating force to make the seal span the annular space. In Housas, the tubular 14 abuts edges 28 and 30 of the seal but the seal shape is such that its cantilevered component (36, 38) spans the annular space quite independently of the base of the seal between surfaces 28 and 30 being pushed into a groove in the tubular 14. Since the seal segment (36, 38) is cantilevered from the base of the seal that is in the groove, forces on the seal base have nothing to do with energizing Housas' seal to

span an annular space. This is because the additional cantilevered portion of the seal is already across the annular space, by design and simply derives one-ended support from the base to do so. No amount of longitudinal base compression can cause this cantilevered component to be “activated” by compression, if any, between sides 28 and 30 of the base.

Note the compression that Housas is interested in is radial and for that he adds a hard ring 62 to support the fulcrum 56 from moving in radially too much when the bell and spigot joint is made up.

As to claim 2 the term “interference” is not in the Housas reference and the Examiner is assuming by referring to an inherent feature in the reference that any interference fit exists in groove 12. The Examiner points to no discussion in the specification that suggests any interference fit is contemplated in groove 12. The language at the bottom of Column 2 indicates the base 26 is “generally of the same size” as the groove 12. Hardly a disclosure of any recognition of an interference fit.

Claim 1 is also rejected as anticipated by Ström. This is another bell and spigot joint whose two tubulars are telescoped to make up the joint but the assembled joint is not telescoping. Just as with Housas, Ström does not use the tubular in which the seal is supported to activate it to span the annular space. As admitted by the Examiner, it takes the insertion of pipe 14 into the bell 11 to do any activation. However the seal shape is such that it extends to what will become the annular space when tubular 14 is inserted into the bell 11. The seal in Ström is curved so that it will rotate freely in groove 12 when pipe 14 is inserted. The groove and seal have circular configurations to aid this rotational

movement of the seal. Because of this there is no longitudinal compression of the seal at all simply due to its insertion.

As to claims 2 and 6 the seal in Ström rotates in the groove; quite the opposite from even having compression much less an interference fit. There is no discussion of beveled ends of the sealing surfaces 17 and 18 in this reference. Items 17 and 18 are not ends but are simply two surfaces that together make up the entire sealing surface of the seal in Ström. To the extent the Examiner considers the entirety of surface 17 the upper end and the entirety of the surface 18 as the lower end or vice versa the bevel, if any, is in the center where these two surfaces meet as defined by angle α . The bevel in claim 6 is near an end.

As to claim 15 see the discussion of bevel with regard to claim 6 and the discussion as to claim 1 that the Ström joint is not even telescoping as opposed to being telescoped together when assembled.

The remaining claims are submitted to be in allowable condition over the cited art.

Respectfully submitted,



Peter Bielinski
Registration No.: 29,282
Cooper Cameron Corporation
P.O. Box 1212
Houston, Texas 77251-1212
Phone: 713 939 2411
Fax: 713 939 2856

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING 31 CFR 1.8(a)

I hereby certify that this correspondence along with any referred to as attached or enclosed is being deposited with the US Postal Service as First Class mail, postage prepaid in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Arlington, VA 22313-1450 on the 6th day of June 2005.

Signature:


Rita Kompa